UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/807,510	03/24/2004	Tao Lu Lowe	059516-0058	3378	
	7590 01/27/201 ', WILL & EMERY	EXAMINER			
600 13th Street,	N.W.	FUBARA, BLESSING M			
Washington, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1618		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/27/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/807,510	LOWE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
BLESSING M. FUBARA	1618	

E	BLESSING M. FUBARA	1618					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	rs on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 15 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this							
application, applicant must timely file one of the following re							
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appea							
for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF periods:	R 1.114. The reply must be filed	within one of the follow	ing time				
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of 	the final rejection						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv		in the final rejection which	chever is later. In				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	. ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	ED WITHIN TWO				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on	which the netition under 37 CFR 1.1	36(a) and the appropriate	extension fee				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter							
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sho							
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later th may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an three months after the mailing dat	e of the final rejection, ev	en it timely tilea,				
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complia	ince with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extens			appeal. Since a				
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with	in the time period set forth in 37	CFR 41.37(a).					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, bu			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cons	•	E below);					
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better 		lucina or simplifyina th	ne issues for				
appeal; and/or	Tominor appear by materially rec	adding or simplifying th	ie issues ioi				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a co	rresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121	. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow	vable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provid		l be entered and an ex	planation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ed below of appended.						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1.2,4-6,8,9 and 16-24</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>7, 10-15</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but be	pefore or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will not	be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and s							
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	·		•				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a							
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ove							
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary a							
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	illy is below or allache	eu.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered	ed but does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for a	llowance				
because:							
See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (P	TO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							
	/Plansing M. Eubara/						
	/Blessing M. Fubara/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1618					
	Filliary Examiner, Alt O	1111 1010					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 1 requires further search and consideration .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: While the proposed amendment may overcome the art of record, the proposed amendment in which the ratio of the smart segment to the hydrophobic segment to hydrophilic segment is as proposed to be limited requires further search and consideration. The proposed hydrogel composition and the data referenced by applicant on Table 2 is directed to release of one active/biological agent, NGF, while claim 1 is generic, a number of smart segment polymers are possible in claim 1, while the data in Table 2 is specific to a specific smart segment. While the examiner may have agreed with the applicant that a citation of the ratio of the smart segment to the hydrophobic segment may overcome the prior art as used in the rejection, the proposed amendment after the final rejection requires further consideration and search.